



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—PSEUDO-IONISM IN THE SECOND CENTURY A. D.

The following paper on the use of the Ionic dialect in the second century A. D. was prepared in 1880 in connection with some studies in Lucian. As nothing has appeared since then in connection with the three Ionic pieces discussed, I publish it as written. I have added some notes from Karsten's dissertation, *De Titulorum Ionicorum Dial. Commentatio* (1882).

It seems probable that the Ionic, together with the other dialects, had ceased to be used for literary purposes, except in a most artificial manner, before the second century A. D. (cf. Bernhardt *Griech. Lit.* I, §§111 and 85).

Indeed an examination of the examples left to us and the references to them (cf. Lobeck's *Aglaoph.* II, pp. 997 and 998, and Lucian, *Tauch. ed.* XIV 13-15; XXI 1; XXV 16) leads us to question what degree of purity existed even in the spoken dialects. The persistence, however, of language must not be underrated, and Lucian (XXXIX 15), in speaking of a woman from Smyrna, uses the expression *καθαρῶς Ἰωνικόν* in describing her speech.

I have made a comparison of the two Ionic pieces which are included among Lucian's writings—*De Syria Dea* and *De Astrologia*—and of Arrian's *Historia Indica*, in order to determine how far they severally agree with Herodotus in the matter of form.

For the text of Herodotus Stein's last edition (1877) has been assumed as the best provisional authority; for Arrian, Hercher's (*Teub.*) text and Dübner's (*Didot*) with v. r.; for Lucian, Reitz (1743) with v. r.; Jacobitz (1836 and *Teub.* 1851); Dindorf's *Tauch. ed.* (1858), the *Didot* edition, and also his *Commentatio de Dial. Herod.* in the *Didot* edition of Herodotus. This latter contains a synopsis of his emendations or corrections of the Ionism of the *De Syria Dea* and *De Astrologia*.

For these two pieces I have given below those deviations only (except for illustration of Arrian) from Herodotean form which Dindorf either incorrectly noticed or else did not notice at all.

Whatever may be thought of the implication contained in the introduction to Jacobitz's ed. (1851)—“in Parisina illa Luciani editione, recensionis nomine falso insignita, cui adornandae Gu. Dindorfius prospexit”—it can scarcely be asking too much of an

editor to require him to give in his critical text not what the author ought to have written, but, as nearly as may be discovered, what he did write. This is Dübner's method in his edition of Arrian. He confines himself almost exclusively to emending such forms, etc., as are inconsistent with Arrian's own uniform usage in this same piece. He claims, however, that the imitators of Herodotus and Hippocrates did not express the full Ionism of these writers, but conceded something to their own times. Again, the editor of the Teubner text, Rudolph Hercher, taking Dübner's text as a basis, has directed his emendations chiefly to what he considered un-Arrianic; only occasionally has he inserted in his text or noticed the variations from Herodotean form.

Amongst others the following books have been frequently referred to:

1. Merzdorf's two articles: *Curtius Studien*, Vol. VIII, *De Dialecto Herodotea*, and Vol. IX, *Vocalverkürzung und Metathesis im Ionischen*.

2. Renner: *Studien I, Quaest. de Dial. Antiquioris Graec. Poesis Elegiacae et Iambicae*.

3. Erman: *Studien V, De Titulorum Ionicorum Dialecto*.

4. Veitch: *Irregular and Defective Greek Verbs*.

5. The introductions and Uebersicht des Dialekts to the editions both of Abicht and Stein.

6. Bredow: *Quaest. Crit. de Dial. Herod. (Lipsiae, 1846)* when not too antiquated for use.

In a work of this kind only an approximate degree of certainty can be attained. There are four more or less unknown factors in the problem: 1. What is truly Herodotean usage? 2. Did a given author intend rigidly and uniformly to imitate the dialect of Herodotus and of him only? 3. If so, how much is to be attributed to carelessness and how much to ignorance on the part of the author himself? 4. How far are the deviations or coincidences due to otherwise scribes?

In spite of all this uncertainty, many points may be considered settled by investigations already made.

Merzdorf (*Studien VIII*, p. 207) is no doubt justified in believing that but little additional light can be thrown upon the text of Herodotus from the pseudo-Ionists of the second century; but we are in the dark in regard to many of the most fundamental questions concerning the Ionic dialects, and the following collation of facts, interesting in itself as showing the character and extent of

this pseudo-Ionism, may prove useful in some subsequent investigation.

No full examination of Arrian's Ionism has heretofore, as far as I know, been published, and the following notes will show that the collection of variations in the two Lucianic pieces, given in the introduction to the Didot edition of Herod., is in part superficial and in part at variance with more recently discovered facts.

Of the three pieces under consideration the *Historia Indica* presents the fewest difficulties.

As it is transmitted as genuine, the investigation is not complicated by the question of authorship.

Arrian's Ionism also more closely resembles the usage of Herodotus. He has some divergencies which are not found in the Lucianic pieces, but there are fewer in proportion to the bulk, which is about twice that of the other two combined. The question remains: Did he intend a thorough imitation of Herodotus? It may be assumed provisionally that he did.

As was to be expected in so close an imitator of Xenophon, there are to be found also in this piece reminiscences of that author: *e. g.*, §2, τὰ δὲ . . . πρὸς ἔω. For, apart from the un-Herodotean form of the word itself, Herodotus seems to have generally used the article in this combination; cf. II 8 and V 49, πρὸς τὴν ἡῶ, but II 32, πρὸς ἡῶ. In Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 49 is found precisely this combination τὰ πρὸς ἔω.

ἀπόμαχος, §1, is a Xenophontean word. So ναυσίπορος, §4, is the Xenophontean form (see below). These and other expressions occur, but there is unmistakable evidence that Arrian strove, in addition to the forms, to give his diction an Herodotean flavor. Thus 3, 10, δοκέειν (*v. r.* δοκέει) δ' ἔμοιγε; cf. Herod. I 131 (with ὥς) and often without ὥς; I 172; II 4, 42, etc. Again, compare 4, 7, ἔνθαπερ αὐτὸς ἔωυτοῦ στεινότητος, ἐς ἑκατὸν σταδίων, and 10, 6, μακροτάτη αὐτῇ ἔωυτης . . . ἐς ὀγδοήκοντα σταδίων, with Herod. IV 85, τῇ εὐρύτατος αὐτὸς ἔωυτοῦ, στάδιοι τριηκόσιοι, etc.; cf. also I 203; II 8.

Often there is evident an effort to imitate Herodotus' manner in order of words; cf., *e. g.*, 5, 10-13 and, especially for matter, 13, with Herod. II 42-45. But the imitation of matter is more successful than that of the manner; cf. H. I. 6-9 with Herod. II 13-25. ἔεται δὲ ἡ Ἰνδῶν γῇ τοῦ θέρεος H. I. 6, 4 (and sqq.) with Herod. II 13, ὥς ἔεται πάντα ἡ χώρα τῶν Ἑλλήνων; also Herod. I 193; II 13, 22, 25; III 10; IV 50, 198. H. I. 6, 7 the allusions are to Herod. II 20 and 22, who combats there these reasons for the overflow of the

Nile, etc. The careful distinguishing between personal and indirect knowledge, familiar to the reader of Herodotus, becomes sometimes ludicrous, as in 15, 1, *τίγριος δὲ δορὴν μὲν ἰδεῖν λέγει Νέαρ-χος, αὐτὸν δὲ τίγριν οὐκ ἰδεῖν*; cf. d. d. S. §1 and §45.

For *ἀμφί* c. dat. (H. I. 18, 4) = *περί* c. gen. cf. Kühn II, p. 424, and add to his examples Herod. V 52; VI 131.

Some other coincidences in vocabulary may be mentioned. Thus *λίμνης ἰχθυώδεος* (§41, 1) recalls *λίμνη ἰχθυώδης*, Herod. VII 109, and in §29, after telling his story in the preceding sentences much as Herod. does, he uses (14) the expression *ἄλλες δὲ αὐτόματοι γίνονται*: with this in particular cf. Herod. IV 53 *ἄλλες τε ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ αὐτόματοι πῆγνυνται ἄπλετοι*. Compare the passage in general.

The *motif*, then, however superficially carried out, was a desire to revive the style, selection of matter, and treatment of Herodotus, as well as his dialect. In addition to the points cited above, the digressions (*e. g.*, §6, etc.), after the manner of Herod., and the speeches introduced §§20, 34 and 36, bear witness to this.

The authorship of the d. d. S. and the De Astrologia has been much discussed, and the conclusion has been pretty general that they are not by Lucian. Before accepting this conclusion, however, it may be asked: 1. Are they necessarily by the same hand? 2. If not, does one more than the other recall Lucianic peculiarities of style, diction or treatment? 3. What reason can be assigned for the production of either one or the other?

Dindorf classes both pieces together, and in a sufficiently sweeping style declares (Com. de Dial. Herod. §22): "Exceptis paucorum quorundam vocabulorum formis, *totae* sunt ad imitationem Herodoti compositae." But it would seem that little except mere external dialectic peculiarities can be urged by way of imitation of Herodotus in the De Astrologia. Nor is it necessary to assume that Lucian was the author either of both, or else of neither of the two. An examination shows that they are different both in manner and in matter. It may be noted that the d. d. S. is wanting in Codex T (Vaticanus No. 87), but this Codex is "fine mutilus."

In the d. d. S. the hand of Lucian is suggested for the following reasons: 1. There is suppressed satire running through the piece. 2. The imitation of Herodotus is in many places decided enough to imply an author as familiar with Herodotus as we know Lucian to have been.

First, as to this point, we must assume that the description is written either by some superstitious author or else as a covert

satire upon persons of that character. To see Lucian in this latter rôle, cf. Alexander, Philopseudes, and Peregrinus. *E. g.*, §13, the grave statement of the wonder in comic imitation of Herod. So in §25, a plain reminiscence of Herod. III 84 and 118, it is like Lucian to find the original account outdone by changing ἦν μὴ γυναικί to οὐδ' ἦν γυναικί.

It is like Lucian to relish his satire, and (§29 *ad fin.*) it is like him to find: "For my part, I think the fear of falling also contributes a good deal to their wakefulness." Again, §30 *ad fin.* seems like Lucianic mockery; cf. too §32. §37 reminds us of the lies which he tells the credulous mob about the death of Peregrinus. In §40 note the half-casual addition of ἔτι γυναικας. In §45 καὶ εἶχε τὸ ποίημα might be either Lucian's fun or the credulity of a dupe, but in the next section the solemn explanation, by conjecture, of the jugglery would be admirable by way of imitation of Herod. §§53 and 54 seem to contain hits at Jewish observances (cf. *De Morte Peregrini*).

Finally, just as in §1 he said: "γράφω δὲ Ἀσσύριος ἔδων," so at the end, to justify more fully his claim to knowledge, "αὐτοψίῃ," he claims to have been subjected when a boy to the ceremony he describes.

The *De Astrologia*, on the other hand, does not bear the marks of an author who, however great his faults, rarely descended to the level of uniform dullness presented by this piece without the suspicion of satire to enliven it. At most we should have to assume that it was a late production of Lucian's, written possibly during his stay in Egypt, as a lecture, to show his familiarity with mythology. When his vitality had been sapped he may possibly have attempted a serious scientific explanation of current superstitions. In the savage (?) use of the word γοητεία (§10) one might fancy he saw the traces of Lucian's hand, or in a fancied satiric tinge at the end of §24. But the whole is very flat, and is most probably the work of some third-class writer.

Some things, however, would seem to indicate that both are productions of the same author. Compare *De Astr.* §7, καὶ μὴν, and §14, καὶ μέντοι, with *d. d. S.* §10, καὶ μὴν. Also the use of ἔμμεναι for εἶναι, which occurs in both. But this latter epic peculiarity may have belonged to a stock-in-trade of second-century Ionisms, and hence would not prove a unity of authorship. Aretaeus, an imitator of Hippocrates, used it; cf. *Mattaire's Commentariolus*, p. 515: "Infinitivus modus transformat -ειν in -εμεναι,

-ειναι in -έμεναι, -ήναι in ημεναι," *e. g.*, B. I. Morb. Acutorum, c. 7; Morb. Diuturn. I, c. 5, etc., in all of which we find *ἐμμεναι*.

Secondly, imitation of Herodotus. Lucian's own expressions of contempt (*vid. supra*) for those who affect Ionic, do not militate against the probability of his having tried to beat them at their own game, while at the same time he made good his opportunity for ridiculing the piety of the old historian as well as the superstitions of his own time. He has himself (Luc. XXI 1) apprised us of his admiration for Herodotus as a writer, and he certainly would have been as capable of imitating him as would any other writer of the second century A. D.

In the following passages and turns of thought an imitation is apparent. In the first place, the dialectic and other obvious resemblances may be passed over—*e. g.*, *πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*, or *Κομβάβον μὲν μοι (πέρι) τοσάδε εἰρήσθω* or *δοκέειν δέ μοι* (cf. Arr. H. I. and *vid. Dindorf ad loc.*).

In d. d. S. §25, *ὃ Κομβάβε κ. τ. λ.*, reminds us of the address of Darius to the mutilated Zopyrus, Herod. III 155; and further on in the same section there appears to be exaggerated allusion to the honors heaped upon Zopyrus, and by the words *ἐσθῆτες Ἀσσύριαι* we are reminded of the *ἐσθῆτα Μηδικήν* (Herod. III 84); and again, for the permission to go to the king without announcement, cf. Herod. III 84 and 118. And finally, though this is less evident, by the last clause in §25 we are reminded of Herod. III 160: "*τούτῃ γὰρ οὐδεὶς Περσέων ἡξίωσε κω ἑωντὸν συμβαλεῖν.*" Again, in §27, *πρότερον δέ μοι θυμὸς εἰπεῖν* suggests Herod. I 1, *ἦν θυμὸς (ᾠνέεσθαι)*, or VII 116, *θυμὸς σφί ἐγένετο θήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον*. In §30, *ἥσκηται* used of buildings has an Herodotean flavor; cf. Herod. II 130, 169; III 57.

Below follows a comparison of the Ionic forms and the deviations from the Ionism of Herodotus as exhibited in the three pieces under discussion.

§1. *Dual*. It is commonly accepted that Herodotus did not make use of the dual number either in declension or in conjugation (*vid. Stein and Abicht*), and Kühner, *Ausf. Gram.* I, §98, says: "Im ganzen Herodot findet sich der Dual nur an zwei Stellen durch die codd. gesichert" (*i. e.*, I 11 u. 91). In his second volume, however, §349, 3, Kühner tells us: . . . "Prosaiker, wie Herodot, die älteren Attiker, auch Xenophon u. A. gebrauchen denselben (d. i. den Dual) häufig." This latter statement is carelessness, but Dübner also seems to forget the facts when deciding

upon the use of the *fem.* dual of the article: Arr. Ind. XVI 9, ἀμφὼν τῶν χερσῶν, v. l. ἀ. τοῖν χ., "quod," he says, "non recepi, Ionicorum scriptorum exempla quia non in promptu¹ erant." This does not have much point if he is referring to epic usage, while if the so-called "New-Ionic" writers are intended, we are told that it is entirely foreign to the usage at least of Herodotus.

In the d. d. S. §30, we find ὀργυιέων δυοῖν. In the two Herodotean passages above cited, Stein writes δυῶν.² In the H. I. occur a number of instances of the dual, so that we must assume that Arrian, if he was imitating Herodotus in form, neglected or was ignorant of this peculiarity. In §VII 1, δυοῖν: this particular form might be justified from the two passages cited, or from inscriptions, but there occur others both in declension and conjugation—viz.: §XVII 6, . . . δοκίμω ἄνδρε, ἀνεγραψάτην; in §XIV 5 and 6, several instances in a description of an elephant playing a pair of (or rather three) cymbals. The situation may be sufficient to account for a deliberate deviation.

Hippocrates does not seem to have used the dual, and although I have found one instance in his imitator of this period—Aretaeus (Βιβ' ἐγκύψαι τῷ πόδε)—it is not to be found in a number of other passages where pairs (hands, feet, etc.) are mentioned. There does not seem to be secure evidence that either the "New-Ionic" writers used the dual or the Ionists of the second century A. D.

Augment. Dindorf (Commentatio de Dial. Herod. ad d. d. S. §18) conjectures for ἀμείβετο, ἡμείβετο (on the analogy of ἡρξάτο, which he had just above corrected to the true Hdt. form—*vid.* Stein) or ἀμείβεται; in his Tauchnitz edition, however, he writes ἀμείβετο ("never augmented," Stein), and in this same edition, d. d. S. §22, he augments ἀλλίξετο "*now*," as Veitch says significantly (*vid.* Veitch, Greek Verbs s. v.).

Abicht lays down the rule: "In all verbs beginning with the diphthongs *αι, αυ, ευ, οι*, the augment is omitted." Stein, however, limits this, but says that no verbs beginning with *ευ* (except *εὔδω*), or with *οι*, are augmented. He mentions also a number of others beginning with the other diphthongs which are not augmented.

But in Arrian we find *ῥκισμένοι, ῥκει* (Dübner, 18, 10 *ῥκεε*) in 1, 2, 5; 5, 13; 10, 4; 18, 10; 22, 10, etc.

¹ A good example in *Attic* is Andocides I 144, τῶν χερσῶν τῶν ἐμαντοῦ, where the *fem.* article occurs twice, making the reading more secure.

² Genetivum *δυῶν* bis exhibet titulus Chius quinto saeculo exaratus. (Karsten, §12.)

Dindorf (Comment. de Dial. Herod. ad d. d. S. §24) says that the Codices give here *ἐργασμένον*, as *ἐργάσαο*, §25 (for term. cf. Merz. Studien VIII, p. 187); so too De Astrologia, §23, "*ἐργάζοντο* : Probabilius *ἐργάζοντο*." Stein says, "*ἐργάζομαι* stets ohne Augment." With this compare Arr. H. I. 28 2 : *εἶων* Ep. and Att. for *ἔων*. So d. d. S. §31, epic form *εἴαται* ; cf. Herod. II 86 *κατέαται*, and IX 90, *κατέατο*. Dindorf, moreover, d. d. S. §25 (Tauch. ed.) accepts *ἦτεε* for *αἶτεε* ; also, §26, he writes *διητέοντο* for *διαιτέοντο*. Merzdorf and Stein omit augment and give contract form *διαιτῶντο* ; cf. (Studien VIII, p. 194) Catalogue of Contract Verbs, and, *c. g.*, Herod. I 120, 123 ; III 65 ; IV 95, 114, 121, etc.

In this connection cf. form *ἐοικός* in Arr. H. I. 6, 6. Hercher, in accordance with his practice of emending only in accordance with Arrian's own usage, says : "In sequentibus pro *ἐοικός* scripsi *εἰκός*." The commonly approved Herodotean forms are : *οἶκα*, *οἰκός*, etc. Veitch says this is true "in the case of the participle, but the indic. *ἔοικε* occurs often without v. r." Here perhaps it is an epic reminiscence.

In Arr. 13, 10 occurs the form *ἐαλωκότας*. Veitch discusses this form at length, q. v. Merzdorf (Studien, VIII 142) regards *ἦλωκ*-Herodotean.

ἐ)κεῖνος and ἐ)θέλω. In d. d. S. §60, Dindorf (De Dial. Herod.) says : "Scribendum *ἐκεῖνοι* ex codicibus." Erman (De Dial. Tit. Ion. Studien V., p. 286-7) shows from inscriptions that Dindorf and Bredow are wrong in denying the shorter forms for these words.

Declension. Nouns of the third decl. ending in *ις* and *υς*. In the acc. pl. Stein allows both the contracted and uncontracted forms,¹ and so Kühner (cf. I, p. 348, "Die ep. Akkusativform auf *ιας* st. *ις* kommt sehr häufig vor, so *πόλιας* an sehr vielen Stellen ohne Variante, ebenso . . . *πανηγύριας*," 6, 3). Arrian, however, seems to have used the uncontracted forms throughout ; cf. Hist. Ind. 7, 2, 3 ; II, 11 ; 12, 5 ; 32, 11 *πόλιας*, and 6, 8, etc. *ιχθύας* ; 15, 3 *τίγριας* (Cod. A *τίγρηας*), etc.

So also in the two Lucianic pieces Jacobitz has the uncontracted forms throughout. Dindorf, however (Tauch. ed., 1858), without adducing MS authority writes *πανηγύρις*, d. d. S. §§1 and 2, and *πόλις*, De Astr. §23 (R. and J. *πόλιας*), but De Astr. §7 and d. d. S. §14 *ιχθύας*, and De Astr. §22 *πόλιας*. In nom. pl. Stein gives *πόλιες* (*πόλις* ?) and Kühner says : "Der Nom. Pl. findet sich nur ganz

¹Accusativi pluralis exempla in quinti saeculi titulis habes duo, alterum solutam praebens formam *πόλ(ι)ας*, alterum contractam *πρήσις* (Karsten, §11, 3).

vereinzelt ohne Variante." D., however, writes, d. d. S. §10, *πανηγύρις*; §12, *ῥφίς*; and §14, *πίστις*. In Arr. H. I. 8, 5, Dübner, *πόλιες* (Cod. *πόλῃες*).

βοῦς and *χοῦς*. The epic acc. pl. *βόας* occurs in d. d. S. (D. and J.) §54; De Astr. §22 (probably here an Homeric reminiscence, "*Ἡελίου τὰς βόας*"); and Arr. H. I. 7, 7. Herodotus always has acc. pl. *βοῦς* (cf. Kühner, I, p. 352), but nom. pl. *βόες*. Merzdorf (Studien VIII, p. 215) discusses¹ this form and also *χοῦς*, **χοφος*, *χοῦν*. In Arr. H. I. 13, 3 and 5 this latter word occurs once in the Herodotean form *χοῦν* and once *χόον*. For the sake of uniformity Dübner changes one (c. 5) and writes both *χόον*. But Kühner, I, p. 393: "In der Bedeutung von aufgeworfener Erde (which is the meaning l. c.) geht *ὁ χοῦς* nur nach *βοῦς*." So Stein, *χοῦν*, Hdt. VII 23.

Some other points may be noticed in the third declension. Thus *μάντιων*, Astr. §23, for *μαντίων* (c. g., Hdt. III 124). Arrian, H. Ind. §18, 4; 18, 10, *Ἀμφιπόλεως*² and *-λεῖς*³ occur for the Hdtean. forms *-όλιος* and *-λι*, and 21, 3 *ἀμπώτεσι* for *ἀμπώτισι*. Elsewhere, Ind. 29, 9; 30, 8 and 37, 5, Arrian has the form *ἀνάπτωσις*.

Passing to adj. in *-γεως*, we find that Dindorf allows, d. d. S. §7, the word *ξανθόγεως*; but adjectives formed from *γῆ* take, in Hdt., the suffix *-γαίος* (*vid.* Stein), although the prefix is *γεω-* (c. g., *γεωπέδων* and *vid.* Merz. St. IX, p. 236). Hence this should be *ξανθόγαίος*, if formed as in Herodotus. Arrian has the correct form—c. g., 22, 2 *μεσσογαίην*.

In the declension of the word *Μίνως* we find, De Astrol. §20, the acc. sing. *Μίνω*. This is the epic form (though also the Attic). The Attic decl. runs *Μίνως*, gen. *Μίνωος* (once *Μίνω*), acc. *Μίνω*. In Hdt. it is declined, gen. *Μίνω* (*βίς*), acc. *Μίνων*; cf. Hdt. 170 and 171. Once, indeed, the gen. *Μίνωος* does occur, but from this would have resulted, according to the ordinary rules of Ionic resolution, *Μίνωα* in the acc., just as the acc. *Ἡρώα* is found in Hdt. alongside of the form *Ἡρών* (*Μίνωα* and *Μίνω* are also found in v. ll.)

¹ But see K. Z. Vol. XXV, pp. 17 and 19.

² *πόλεως* . . . in titulo Chio bis legitur (Karsten, §18, 4).

³ Reitz, ad d. d. S. §60: "*ἀπέλει*. Qui delicias Ionicas amat, *πολύ* scriberet. . . . Sed quia *πέλει* perpetuo in hac Dial. ut c. 1, 10, 13, 21 ac 22, etc., nihil mutavi, etsi scribarum vitium puto." Dindorf changes to *πέλει* (Roehl, I. G. No. 497, 31, *δυνάμει*; cf. Renner, Stud. V 305). Karsten, §11, gives *χῆσι* from a fifth-century inscription; cf. also §17.

So in d. d. S. §22 D. allows the Ep. gen. γούνων for Herod. γουνάτων, although just below he corrects the Ep. gen. ἀπρήκτοιο.

Contracts. In d. d. S. §55, Dindorf would write αείρας for ἄρας, with which compare §52, αείπαρτες. There is much diversity of opinion on this point. Stein always writes the uncontracted forms—*e. g.*, I 87; I 90; VIII 56, etc. Veitch,¹ however, says that Hdt. uses the contract form as well as the other, and that both forms occur in Hippocrates. Arrian (H. I.) has constantly the contract forms—*e. g.*, 25, 7; 27, 2, 3, 4, 6; 29, 1, 7. Finally, Merzdorf (Stud. V, pp. 186-7) says: "Bredovius, Dindorfius, Steinius plenior formam solam Herodoteam esse statuerunt, quod, *quamquam in tit. Ephes. C. I 2953*, a Kirchhoffio . . . medio saeculo quinto attributo, ἐπάρας ἐπάρη reperitur, itemque in mitiore Hippocratis Ionismo formae contractae praevalent: . . . (Renner, St. I 1, 189), jure fecerunt, cum analogia vocabulorum αείδω ἄισμα deciens exstantium et verborum αεικείη αεικές etiam αείρω solutum poscat." The verb (ἐπ)ᾠφείδω occurs too, Arr. Ind. 10, 1, in the contracted form ἐπᾠδονται. (This is also left uncontracted by Stein.)

Compounds with *ἑργος* are usually (for exceptions *vid.* Stein) left uncontracted in Herodotus (cf. Merzdorf, Studien VIII, p. 213); in Arr. Ind. 12, 1 the forms δημιουργικόν and λειτουργοί; προῦπτον, §20, 3, therefore do not conform. So also §9, 5, τεσσαρακοντούτες (wrong also in the numeral itself. Ionic τεσσεράκοντα), and finally §9, 7, τριακοντούτες. Arrian has the correct form, ἥλιος, which Dindorf notices as Herodotean in his Commentatio, although he retains ἥελιος "ex codicibus" in his Tauch. ed. of Lucian.

Arrian, H. I. 19, 5, has the form δώδεκα. Herod. wrote δυνώδεκα (cf. Stein); for this we have independent evidence from a Thasian inscription (*vid.* Studien V, p. 306, Erman) containing this word.

In reference to the declension of the word βορέης a few points may be noticed. d. d. S. §28, βορέην the acc. is the correct Ionic form, but the tetrasyllabic genitive βορέεω is not Herodotean. Dindorf, to be sure, so declines the word and (Comm. de Dial. Her. §9) says: "Si poetae literam ejicere quam synizesin duabus ultimis

¹ Supporting Veitch is Brugmann, K. Z. XXVII, pp. 197-8: "Neben der präsensform αείρω (Homer, Herodot, tragiker), . . . hat man die form αἰρω bei, . . . Herodot (ἀπαίρωσι, VIII 57, 60; ἐπαίρεις, VII 10)." Speaking of the analogy of αείδω, αεικής, etc., he says: "Unsere darlegung zeigt das dieser grund zu ausmerzung von αἰρω bei Herodot hinfällig ist."

syllabis adhibere maluerunt, rationem secuti sunt idoneam. Quae quum nulla sit in oratione prosa, ego plenam formam $\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\omega$ ubique vel ex codicibus vel ex conjectura restitui," etc. But Merzdorf (St. VIII, p. 172), in treating of the combination $\epsilon\epsilon\omega$, brings up various examples to show that this special triple combination¹ was not liked by the Ionians, and instances this word $\beta\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, claiming that the trisyllabic form only has MS authority.

Dübner, Arr. Ind. 2, 1, writes (contrary to Codex A, which has $\beta\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon$) $\beta\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\omega$. Arrian 6, 9 has also the form $\beta\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ for the Herodotean $\beta\omicron\rho\eta\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$.

Another group of contractions may be noticed in connection with the form which Dindorf (De Astr. §17) writes—*i. e.*, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$. According to Merzdorf, St. VIII, p. 221, this is a false analogy from the true contractions in the aor. and perf. of $\beta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\omega$. Merzdorf claims that there was an essential difference between the η sprung from ϵ , as in $\nu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, and that from α , as in $\beta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\omega$. Stein, however, admits these contracts from $\nu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ when they occur alongside of the uncontracted forms, but derives them from a different stem. Merzdorf thinks this incredible. Still further astray, he continues, is Dindorf in making the contraction within the stem—*e. g.*, $\beta\omega\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ for $\beta\omicron\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$, as if parallel to $\beta\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$. Stein agrees on this point: " $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\acute{\omega}\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ u. ä. von $\beta\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ standen bisher an einigen Stellen, haben sich aber als gefälscht erwiesen." In this connection is to be noted, Arr. Ind. 10, 6, the un-Herodotean form $\delta\gamma\delta\acute{\omicron}\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ for $\delta\gamma\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$.

Contractions in flexional endings, especially in verbs ending in $\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, and $\acute{\omicron}\omega$. As little or nothing is certainly established (*vid.* Merzdorf's detailed discussions in St. VIII), I will notice only a few forms in the pieces under our consideration. In De Astr. §19, if Herodotean forms are to be inserted at all, we must read for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\omega\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, either $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (cf. Hdt. IV 103; VII 61, 92), or, if the question be so decided, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

In Arr. H. I. 20, 3, Dübner has emended $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\nu\omicron\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ to $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\nu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$, while $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\mu\alpha\chi\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$, §24, 2 (fut.) (per emend. Dübneri), would be

¹ To show the need of caution in accepting any sweeping statements about the passion of the Ionians for vowel-sounds indefinitely succeeding one another, it is worth while to note the results from the inscriptions; *e. g.*, Erman St. V, p. 290 (De Tit. Ionic. Dial.), in discussing proper names made up of the suffix from $\kappa\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, says: "Diu . . . ante Herodotum in duabus Ionum sedibus inter se quam maxime distantibus, Mileti et in coloniis Chalcidensibus, contractam reperimus formam (*i. e.*, $-\kappa\lambda\eta\varsigma$)." *Vid.* also p. 291 *ad fin.*

ἀπομαχεσόμενοι (Veitch and Abicht), or ἀπομαχησόμενοι (Stein), if conformed to Herodotus.

Of the transfer of verbs in -αω to -εω not much need be said. Dindorf in his *Commentatio* corrects the numerous un-Herodotean forms of the verb ὀράω found in his edition of 1858 in accordance with the laws given by Merzdorf (cf. Stein VIII, p. 207, etc.). The form μεταπηδέων (Ion. for μεταπηδάων), d. d. S. §36, shows that the author of the d. d. S. was not ignorant of this dialectic law. Of the usage of Arrian, Dübner says in the preface to the Didot edition: "Verborum in έω formae Ionicae frequentes sunt in codicibus, atque eas haud cunctanter posui ubique: sed verborum in αω et in όω nullae usquam praeter vulgares formas apparent, exceptis tribus, όρέομεν, κομόωντες (*bis*) et χρεόμενοι: in his igitur substiti, quum vel in nativis Ionibus horum verborum conjugatio nondum prorsus sit ad liquidum perducta."

Of the following verbs in the *Hist. Ind.*—*i. e.*, πλανάμενοι 7, 2; τρυγῶσι 11, 10; θηρῶσι 13, 1; ἐξεπήδων 28, 4; ἀναφυσώμενον 30, 2; ἐπηρώτων (wrongly for -ειρωτων, cf. Veitch) 33, 6; βοῶντες 33, 7; and ἀνθρώτα (wrongly for ἀνειρώτα) 35, 7—all except τρυγῶσι (wh. Stein, Herod. IV 199, contracts) and ἐξεπήδων are included by Merzdorf (*vid.* St. VIII) in his lists of verbs which are either usually or always contracted in Herodotus as in Attic.

The remaining forms—*i. e.*, those from ὀράω—contracted by Arrian—*e. g.*, ὀρώμενα 30, 6; and κατορῶσιν (3 p., pl.) (emended by Dübner from καθορ-) 32, 6 and 37, 4—are shown by Merzdorf to vary greatly in the MSS.

Diaeresis. In De Astr. §1 (Dind. Tauch. ed.) μαντεῖης and ἀληθείης occur. The latter is correctly retained (ex Cod. 90) as coming from the proparoxytone ἀλήθεια, while the form μαντηίης from the paroxytone μαντεία should have been allowed to stand (cf. Abicht: Uebersicht des Dial. Herod. §2). In De Astr. §2, from the two readings αἰδρή ("codex unus") and αἰδρείη ("alii") he selects the former in his Tauch. edition, possibly because this is an epic word. In his *Commentatio*, however, he had said: "Quod αἰδρηίη scribendum." Stein and Abicht, however (Hdt. VI 69), edit αἰδρείη, on the analogy of ἀλήθειᾶ, ἀληθείη.

With this cf. Arr. H. I. §17, 4, ἀνδρίην (v. r. ἀνδρίαν) for Herodotean form ἀνδρηίην, and §40, 1, λησταί for ληισταί. He writes ἀρίον correctly for ἄρειον, for this is made by Herod. himself (cf. Herod. VIII 52, Abicht) an exception to the rule for proparoxytones.

Dindorf prefers the reading (Cod. 90) De Astr. §§6 and 10 (Tauch. ed.) ξῶια, but Herodotus retained the contraction.

The Ionic form of θαῦμα Stein writes θῶυμα ("ein abgeschwächter oder uneigentlicher Diphthong"). Dindorf in these pieces—*e. g.*, d. d. S. c. 7, and De Astr. c. 3—always corrects to θαμ-; in the Ionizing dialogues, however, as in the Vitarum Auctio, c. 6, he writes θαυμαστή, although he writes ἱροί for ἱεροί. Arrian also gives the form θῶμα, c. 34, 10; 40, 5 (ex Codice).

Interchange of Vowel-Sounds. a for η. In Arr. Ind. c. 9, 10 πολυπραγμονέστατον, and c. 43, 10 πολυπραγμοσύνης, occur for Herodotean πρηγ-¹. Again c. 30, 9, σιαγόσι for σιηγόσι; finally c. 4, 6, 16; 5, 2 ναυσίπορος, which is a *twofold* departure from the Herodotean form νησιπέρητος.

a for ε. Arr. c. 9, 5; 22, 9 has τεσσαράκοντα for τεσσεράκοντα, and c. 13, 2; 21, 13 τέσσαρες for τέσσερες. So in c. 8, 6 he has ἄρσενας for ἔρσενας. Dind. in his Tauch. edition emends De Astr. c. 11, ἄρρενα and ἄρρενες, the late form, to the classic form ἄρσενες, etc. It is hard to see what is gained by this.

ε for α. Arr. Ind. presents pretty uniformly the Attic forms of τέμνω—cf. c. 2, 2; 11, 10; 13, 12; 20, 10—but the Ionic forms of τρέπω. In the Lucianic pieces Dindorf has emended similar slips.

ε for η. In Arrian is found throughout the form ἕως (the East) for ἥως, and ἐῶς for ἥῶς, and ἕωθεν for ἥῶθεν—*e. g.*, 2, 1; 2, 7; 3, 3, 4; 5, 2; 26, 6, etc.

In d. d. S. c. 17 occurs the form κατενεχθῆναι; the Herodotean form is κατενειχθῆναι. So in De Astr. c. 15 κατηνέχθη for κατηνείχθη; cf. Hdt. I 66, 84; II 116, 121 (*fin.*), etc. (Dindorf takes no notice of these forms.)

ει for ε. Arrian H. I. c. 14, 9 the form βόειον occurs: Hdtean. is βόεον. So c. 25, 7 ἀποδεδειγμένον for ἀποδεδεγμένον, and c. 33, 8 δείξειν and ἔδειξε for δέξειν and ἔδεξε. Dindorf notices and corrects the similar un-Herodotean form ἐπέδειξε in d. d. S. c. 25.

ι for ει. εἶκελος—ἱκελος in De Astr. §§10 and 20, and d. d. S. §§25 and 33, D. fluctuates and Stein and Abicht disagree, the former preferring εἶκελος—cf. Herod. III 81, and VIII 8—where the MSS agree in giving this latter form.

ευ for ι. In Arr. H. I. c. 1, 6 occurs εὐθής: Hdtean. ἰθής.

ιε for ι. Arr. H. I. c. 18, 12 ἱερῆια (Dübner for ἱερεία), Hdtean. ἱρήια, cf. De Astr. c. 7, Dind. corrects ἱερά to ἱρά and ἱερώτατον to ἱρότατον. One codex here gives ἱρώτατον.

¹ C. XXXIV, Dübner pref. πρήγματα ex Codice.

ον vs. ο. In Herodotus editors usually (*e. g.*, Abicht) write οὐνομάζω on the analogy of the substantive οὐνομα. In Bk. I 86, however, ὀνομάσαι; and Stein so edits; cf. his Uebers. des Dial. p. 52: "οὐ für ο . . . οὐνομα (aber ὀνομάζω, ὀνομαίνω)." Arr. H. I. c. I, 5; 21, 10; 27, 1 has the common form ὀνομάζω. So Dindorf in his Commentatio, etc., corrects De Astr. c. 23, but writes ὀνομάζεται in his text.

ε for ει: ἔνεκα and ν ἐφελκυστικόν. Arr. H. I. has εἵνεκα once;¹ elsewhere (*e. g.*, 15, 5; 23, 4) ἔνεκα. Dindorf, Commentatio de Dial. Herod. p. 35, says: "Ἐνεκα praepositionis duae tantum in codicibus Herodoti formae reperiuntur, εἵνεκα et εἵνεκεν, eaeque ante consonantes pariter atque vocales. Ego ubique εἵνεκεν scripsi, formarum Ionicarum εἴτεν et ἔπειτεν analogia commendatum. Apud Lucianum (d. d. S. c. 33 et 39) τοῦνεκα pro τοῦ ἔνεκα."

In this connection it may be worth while to speak of the usage of the ν ἐφελκυστικόν in the pieces under discussion. It occurs frequently in the Lucianic pieces, but Dindorf omits it; in Arrian it is sometimes used. Editors usually consider it entirely foreign to the usage of Herod. Erman, however, St. V, p. 278, De Tit. Ionic. Dial.,² says that the Ionic inscriptions show that the insertion of the ν was on the whole more common than its omission, and concludes that its use fluctuated very much as in Attic. It may be noticed in connection with the ν form of ἔνεκα—*i. e.*, εἵνεκεν—that we have here an additional ground against drawing *a priori* conclusions in favor of an inordinate love on the part of the Ionians for combinations of vowel-sounds under all circumstances.

"*i demonstrativum.*" Arr. H. I. c. 3, 3 has ταυτησί. νυνί, Bk. VII 229, is the only example in Herodotus, and Dindorf, d. d. S. c. 23, emends ταυτί to ταυτό (writes, however, in his Tauch. text τωντό).

*Aspirates.*³ d. d. S. c. 16 κάθηται for κάτηται. So in Arr. c. 6, 9 οὐχ for οὐκ; and frequently in Arrian αὐθις for αὐτις; so ἐνταῦθα Arr. c. 21, 12; 42, 1, etc., for ἐνθαῦτα; and c. 37, 8 ἐντεῦθεν for ἐνθεῦτεν; the remaining one of this group of three—χιτών—is written where it occurs once (c. 16, 2) in the proper Herodotean form κιθών.

¹ *Vid.* Dübner, preface: "Semel legitur οὔρεα (in Codice 11, 11), semel οὔροι, pro ὄροι (c. 40, 11), semel εἵνεκα (c. 33, 9), semel μέγαθος (in Cod. c. 29, 10), semel τραποῖατο (c. 12, 12), ad horum normam non sum ausus centena loca refingere, quamquam credo Arrianum his formis esse usum.

² p. 279 . . . Tantum igitur abest, ut dialectus ubique illud ν neglegat, ut vel frequentissimus videatur fuisse illius usus.

³ For aspirates in Ionic inscriptions, cf. Karsten, §3.

Pronouns. In d. d. S. c. 51 occurs the form of the rel. pron. ὅτῳ for Hdtean. ὅτέῳ; so frequently in Arr. Ind. both in gen. and dative—*e. g.*, c. 1, 6; 23, 5, etc. Also the indef. pron. τῷ for τεῷ, c. 5, 13, etc.

Verbal Forms. In d. d. S. c. 7 sqq. Dindorf corrects γίγνεται to γίνεται. In Arrian's H. I. (*e. g.*, 3, 8; 28, 4) the latter form occurs throughout, but this coincidence with the Ionic form may be owing to the fact that γίνομαι from Aristotle onwards (*cf.* Veitch) usurps more and more the place of the Attic prose form. With the use of γίγνομαι compare that of μίγνυται H. I. §4, 16; for Herodotean form μίσσεται *cf.* Veitch. In a second passage, indeed (§17, 3), we find the latter form. In d. d. S. c. 21 the aor. mid. ἐπεμήνατο is Epic and late (Veitch). Hdt. uses the second aor. ἐμάνην. Also in c. 53, 55, the late aor. mid. (Veitch) ξυράμενοι and ἐξύρατο, Herod. uses the act ἐξύρησα.

Verbs in -μι, εἰμί. Very noticeable is the use of the Epic infinitive ἔμμεναι for εἶναι (*cf.* Dind. Com.) both in the d. d. S. and once in the De Astr. c. 26.

While this form is un-Herodotean, we find it in the oracle delivered to Croesus in the familiar passage B. I. 86. Arrian does not use it, but Aretaeus does (*see above*).

In d. d. S. c. 25 the poetical form ἔσσεται is used for ἔσται (*cf.* Hdt. III 134), and in De Astrologia, c. 5, Attic οὔσι for ἔουσι. So Arr. 19, 1 ὄντας.

ἴστημι and τίθημι. In d. d. S. c. 6 ἴστανται for ἰστέαται, also Arr. κατίσταντο c. 7, 9, etc. So in De Astrol. c. 7 ἀνατιθέασι for ἀνατιθείσι (*cf.* Stud. VIII, p. 189).

εἶμι. d. d. S. 28 ἦεισαν for (ἦέσαν) ἦισαν (Veitch, p. 204). Arrian has the ordinary Attic form ἐπήεσαν, 24, 7; 36, 9, etc. ἦιον d. d. S. 25 may be compared with ἦε Herod. II 26, V 51.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.